# Military Affirmative

**OMG this is literally…**

**#NEWBESTAFFNA**

## 1AC Readiness

### Part 1 is Framework.

#### The standard is consequentialism.

#### First, the constitutive obligation of the state is to protect citizen interest—individual obligations are not applicable in the public sphere. Goodin 95

Robert E. Goodin. Philosopher of Political Theory, Public Policy, and Applied Ethics. Utilitarianism as a Public Philosophy. Cambridge University Press, 1995. p. 26-7

The great adventure of utilitarianism as a guide to public conduct is that it avoids gratuitous sacrifices, it ensures as best we are able to ensure in the uncertain world of public policy-making that policies are sensitive to people’s interests or desires or preferences. The great failing of more deontological theories, applied to those realms, is that they fixate upon duties done for the sake of duty rather than for the sake of any good that is done by doing one’s duty. Perhaps it is permissible (perhaps it is even proper) for private individuals in the course of their personal affairs to fetishize duties done for their own sake. It would be a mistake for public officials to do likewise, not least because it is impossible. The fixation on motives makes absolutely no sense in the public realm, and might make precious little sense in the private one even, as Chapter 3 shows. The reason public action is required at all arises from the inability of uncoordinated individual action to achieve certain morally desirable ends. Individuals are rightly excused from pursuing those ends. The inability is real; the excuses, perfectly valid. But libertarians are right in their diagnosis, wrong in their prescription. That is the message of Chapter 2. The same thing that makes those excuses valid at the individual level – the same thing that relieves individuals of responsibility – makes it morally incumbent upon individuals to organize themselves into collective units that are capable of acting where they as isolated individuals are not. When they organize themselves into these collective units, those collective deliberations inevitably take place under very different circumstances and their conclusions inevitably take very different forms. Individuals are morally required to operate in that collective manner, in certain crucial respects. But they are practically circumscribed in how they can operate, in their collective mode. And those special constraints characterizing the public sphere of decision-making give rise to the special circumstances that make utilitarianism peculiarly apt for public policy-making, in ways set out more fully in Chapter 4. Government house utilitarianism thus understood is, I would argue, a uniquely defensible public philosophy.

#### Role-playing as the government is key to real world education—3 unique reasons. Joyner ‘99

Joyner 99 (Christopher, Professor of International Law in the Government Department at Georgetown University, “TEACHING INTERNATIONAL LAW: VIEWS FROM AN INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS POLITICAL SCIENTIST,” ILSA Journal of International & Comparative Law, Spring, lexis)

Use of the debate can be an effective pedagogical tool for education in the social sciences. Debates, like other role-playing simulations, help students understand different perspectives on a policy issue by adopting a perspective as their own. But, unlike other simulation games, debates do not require that a student participate directly in order to realize the benefit of the game. Instead of developing policy alternatives and experiencing the consequences of different choices in a traditional role-playing game, debates present the alternatives and consequences in a formal, rhetorical fashion before a judgmental audience. Having the class audience serve as jury helps each student develop a well-thought-out opinion on the issue by providing contrasting facts and views and enabling audience members to pose challenges to each debating team. These debates ask undergraduate students to examine the international legal implications of various United States foreign policy actions. Their chief tasks are to assess the aims of the policy in question, determine their relevance to United States national interests, ascertain what legal principles are involved, and conclude how the United States policy in question squares with relevant principles of international law. Debate questions are formulated as resolutions, along the lines of: "Resolved: The United States should deny most-favored-nation status to China on human rights grounds;" or "Resolved: The United States should resort to military force to ensure inspection of Iraq's possible nuclear, chemical and biological weapons facilities;" or "Resolved: The United States' invasion of Grenada in 1983 was a lawful use of force;" or "Resolved: The United States should kill Saddam Hussein." In addressing both sides of these legal propositions, the student debaters must consult the vast literature of international law, especially the nearly 100 professional law-school-sponsored international law journals now being published in the United States. This literature furnishes an incredibly rich body of legal analysis that often treats topics affecting United States foreign policy, as well as other more esoteric international legal subjects. Although most of these journals are accessible in good law schools, they are largely unknown to the political science community specializing in international relations, much less to the average undergraduate. [\*386] By assessing the role of international law in United States foreign policy- making, students realize that United States actions do not always measure up to international legal expectations; that at times, international legal strictures get compromised for the sake of perceived national interests, and that concepts and principles of international law, like domestic law, can be interpreted and twisted in order to justify United States policy in various international circumstances. In this way, the debate format gives students the benefits ascribed to simulations and other action learning techniques, in that it makes them become actively engaged with their subjects, and not be mere passive consumers. Rather than spectators, students become legal advocates, observing, reacting to, and structuring political and legal perceptions to fit the merits of their case. The debate exercises carry several specific educational objectives. First, students on each team must work together to refine a cogent argument that compellingly asserts their legal position on a foreign policy issue confronting the United States. In this way, they gain greater insight into the real-world legal dilemmas faced by policy makers. Second, as they work with other members of their team, they realize the complexities of applying and implementing international law, and the difficulty of bridging the gaps between United States policy and international legal principles, either by reworking the former or creatively reinterpreting the latter. Finally, research for the debates forces students to become familiarized with contemporary issues on the United States foreign policy agenda and the role that international law plays in formulating and executing these policies. 8 The debate thus becomes an excellent vehicle for pushing students beyond stale arguments over principles into the real world of policy analysis, political critique, and legal defense.

#### Second, only impacts and values that exist in the physical world are relevant. Physical realism is the only meaningful ontological theory of being. Williams,

Donald Williams. “Naturalism and the Nature of Things.” The Philosophical Review, Vol. 53, No. 5 (Sep., 1944), pp. 417-443. Duke UP. http://www.jstor.org/stable/2181355

Casting up our accounts to this point, we observe that physical realism is in sum a meaningful, consistent, and essentially confirmable hypothesis. We turn accordingly to assess its credibility a posterior, in relation to the actual evidence, as we should that of a scientific theory or a war communique. We can know forthwith that materialism, granted that metaphysics is confirmable at all, is in principle the most thoroughly confirmable of all world hypotheses. It initiates the most conclusive confirmation or disconfirmation. The ideal aim of systematic knowledge is to disclose the fewest primitive elements into which the diversest objects are analyzable, and the fewest primitive facts, singular and general, from which the behavior of things is deducible. Metaphysics is the most 'scientific' of the sciences because it tries the hardest to explain every kind of fact by one simple principle or simple set of principles. It is the most empirical of sciences (as Peirce reminded us) because, by the same token, a metaphysics is relevant to and confirmable by every item of every experience, whereas every other science is concerned with only a few select and abstract aspects of some experiences, Physical realism is the ideal metaphysics, the veritable paradigm of philosophy, because its category of spatio-temporal pattern best permits analysis of diverse complexity to uniform and ordered simplicities, is most thoroughly numerable, and so most exactly and systematically calculable. Socratic purposes, Platonic ideals, Aristotelian qualities, Plotinian hierarchies-these are surds in comparison with a system de la nature, limned in patterns of action in the ordered dimensions of a spatio-temporal hypersphere

#### And consequences are the only values we can experience. Harris 10’

Sam Harris 2010. CEO Project Reason; PHD UCLA Neuroscience; BA Stanford Philosophy.  The Moral Landscape: How Science Can Determine Human Values.”

I believe that we will increasingly understand good and evil, right and wrong, in scientific terms, because moral concerns translate into facts about how our thoughts and behaviors affect the well-being of conscious creatures like ourselves. If there are facts to be known about the well-being of such creatures—and there are—then there must be right and wrong answers to moral questions. Students of philosophy will notice that this commits me to some form of moral realism (viz. moral claims can really be true or false) and some form of consequentialism (viz. the rightness of an act depends on how it impacts the well-being of conscious creatures). While moral realism and consequentialism have both come under pressure in philosophical circles, they have the virtue of corresponding to many of our intuitions about how the world works. Here is my (consequentialist) starting point: all questions of value (right and wrong, good and evil, etc.) depend upon the possibility of experiencing such value. Without potential consequences at the level of experience—happiness, suffering, joy, despair, etc. —all talk of value is empty. Therefore, to say that an act is morally necessary, or evil, or blameless, is to make (tacit) claims about its consequences in the lives of conscious creatures (whether actual or potential).I am unaware of any interesting exception to this rule. Needless to say, if one is worried about pleasing God or His angels, this assumes that such invisible entities are conscious (in some sense) and cognizant of human behavior. It also generally assumes that it is possible to suffer their wrath or enjoy their approval, either in this world or the world to come. Even within religion, therefore, consequences and conscious states remain the foundation of all values.

#### Three implications:

#### Claims about the origins of moral obligations must be rooted in the physical world, as there are no abstract principles.

#### Only standards that link into this conception of ontology can be applied since physical realism limits the scope of what impacts are considered existent.

#### We default to consequentialism because only it takes natural impacts of pain and suffering into consideration.

### Part 2 is the Plan

#### Text: The United States Federal Government ought to pay a living wage to military personnel. McClellan ‘14

Ken McClellan. Raising Minimum Wage Will Pay More Than US Pays Troops! February 28, 2014. http://www.middletowninsider.com/2014/02/raising-minimum-wage-will-pay-more-than.html?m=1

My point is that the soldiers, the men and women who put boots on the ground, are being forgotten. There is talk of cutting the military budget. Which will mean no raises for these men and women, while Congress and federal employees will get their cost-of-living increases, as they do every year. The President often speaks of fairness and equality. It's time to talk about being fair to the soldiers. They deserve a fair, living wage as much, if not more so than the clerks, cooks and dishwashers. Before you talk about taking care of federal civilian employees, DO SOMETHING about taking care of military personnel.

#### And, it’s inherent - military wages are insufficient to meet basic cost of living standards. Leitsinger ‘14

MIRANDA LEITSINGER. Hungry Heroes: 25 Percent of Military Families Seek Food Aid. 2014. http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/hungry-heroes-25-percent-military-families-seek-food-aid-n180236

SAN DIEGO, Calif. — Petty Officer 1st Class Adam Yetter, a Navy sailor for 17 years, works a second job as a security guard and donates blood plasma twice a week to help make ends meet for his family. Deployed seven times during his military career, including an extended 19-month tour to Iraq, Yetter squeezes in family time with his three young boys and his wife in-between jobs. To save money, the Yetters recently moved off base into a two-bedroom apartment they share with another sailor and his two sons, who stay there part time. Despite their penny-pinching efforts, the Yetters have been living paycheck-to-paycheck for many years as they work to get rid of debt accumulated over everyday expenses like car repairs and gas and the costs of caring for an autistic son. They often visit food pantries to keep their kitchen stocked. “We’re doing everything we can possibly think to be doing and we're barely making it,” said Adam’s wife, Lindsey, 36. (Adam declined comment). She accesses many local pantries, uses money-saving strategies and has met with a financial adviser to get the family budget into the black, but they’re stuck, she said. “You're robbing Peter to pay Paul most of the time,” said Yetter, a teaching assistant at a preschool. Yetter’s family is among the 620,000 households that include at least one soldier, reservist or guardsman – or 25 percent of the nation’s total active duty and reserve personnel – that are seeking aid from food pantries and other charitable programs across the country, according to a rare inquiry about the food insecurity of troops and veterans conducted by Feeding America, a hunger relief charity, that will be released Monday. Another 2.37 million households including veterans receive assistance from food pantries that are part of Feeding America's network (this figure doesn't include households where both a former and current service member reside). The help is sought for various reasons, experts say: For active duty, pressures include low pay, poor financial planning by junior soldiers, the difficulty for spouses to hold steady jobs amid base transfers and deployments, and the higher costs of living in some states. For veterans, the triggers are the transition to the civilian world, and, for some, living off low disability pay or retirement funds. Both groups were hit by the Great Recession, too. “We’ve heard for the last several years from our food banks that there’s a growing need among military families for food assistance,” said Maura Daly, a Feeding America spokeswoman. Though the organization “found the results to be incredibly disheartening” it also will give Feeding America the opportunity “to partner with military organizations on the ground to help ensure that we are better meeting their needs,” she added. Defense Department spokesman Lt. Cmdr. Nate Christensen said in a statement on Friday that the Pentagon was reviewing the survey and was “concerned with anything that impacts the wellness and readiness of service members and families. The work of Feeding America and other organizations will help the department amplify the DOD resources available to service members and families, particularly in high-cost locations.” He added that the Pentagon “recognizes that personal financial readiness of service members and their families must be maintained to sustain mission readiness” and offers personal financial management counselors, as well as other tools and services, to help personnel get a clear understanding of their finances. Military stores – like exchanges and commissaries – provide savings to troops, he said. (On Monday, the Pentagon issued a new statement on the survey, saying: "The Department of Defense disagrees with the methodology that Feeding America used to calculate the estimated percentage of military households served by its food assistance programs.") Spikes in food aid sought by active duty service members, reservists, guardsmen and veterans emerged in states with large military bases, like in Delaware, California, Texas, Colorado, Georgia, Washington and Virginia, according to Feeding America data from its "Hunger in America 2014" report, a national study it runs every four years. Other surges came in states where a lot of people join the military, like Iowa, and then return home after being discharged. More than 60,000 clients of the organization’s network and 32,000 of its partner agencies participated in the survey. Operation Homefront, a nonprofit focusing on the lowest-paid enlisted service members, wounded warriors and their families, said requests for food assistance from people they serve tripled starting in 2009 and have only slightly receded since then. Adding to the financial strain for military families, the Defense Department this year issued its lowest pay raise – 1 percent - in 50 years, according to the Military Officers Association of America, a nonpartisan nonprofit focused on military personnel matters, and it will seek the same level from Congress through 2017. Limiting the pay increase came after Congress in 2000 passed a law to redress the salary gap between civilians and the military, which was then at 13.5 percent, the association said. The new pay cap hurts retention and readiness, particularly impacting young military families already living on tight budgets, said Army Col. Mike Barron (Ret.), the association’s deputy director of government relations. “It’s going to cause them (soldiers) to not be as focused on their job at hand and a lot of the jobs that we have, lives depend on them being focused,” he said. The financial hardships translate into “more stress on the force, more stress on the service member, more stress on their family,” he added. The DOD said in its FY2015 budget request that the rate of growth in military pay and benefits over the last decade had “more than closed compensation gaps” but it couldn’t sustain that pace in the current constrained fiscal environment. A 2012 Pentagon study found that pay for enlisted soldiers, who have the lowest salaries in the military, exceeded wages paid to 90 percent of civilians with similar qualifications. For enlisted soldiers, pay starts at about $18,000 for new recruits and can reach upward of $65,000 for some who log more than 18 years in the military, according to the DOD’s pay grade for 2014. While they also get tax-free allowances for housing, food and clothing, many families said they were still struggling to get by. In interviews with veterans and active duty families, many told NBC they had various schemes for trying to stretch their dollars or raise extra cash: recycling, couponing, visiting multiple food pantries and homeless shelters for emergency food like milk for their children, buying groceries from dollar stores, delaying payment of utility bills, and signing up for food stamps and WIC – the nutrition program for women, infants and children. Some 2 percent of troops and 7 percent of veterans received food stamps from 2009 to 2012, according to the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey. Similar data for WIC wasn’t available. “Lowest income military families are living paycheck to paycheck, and even those paychecks aren't enough to make ends meet,” said Shana Hazan, a director at Jewish Family Service (JFS) of San Diego, which began holding food distributions at military locations in early 2007. As JFS makes its yearly plans, “I don't think we ever questioned whether the need will remain in terms of food insecurity among military families. That is just a base of assumption for us.”

### Part 3 is Advantages

#### Military readiness - US military recruitment is low now—3 reasons. Maze ‘13

Rick Maze. Services prepare for scant recruiting year. May. 2, 2013. http://www.armytimes.com/article/20130502/NEWS/305020027/Services-prepare-scant-recruiting-year

Finding recruits to join the military in 2014 could be increasingly challenging, even with declining recruiting goals, defense and service personnel officials are warning Congress. At the moment, it’s hard to see the problem: The services all met their goals for quality and quantity for the active forces in the first quarter of fiscal 2013. In the reserve components, only the Army Reserve has missed its goals. “Generally, a slow economy makes recruiting less challenging, and operates to the advantage of those who are hiring, including the U.S. military,” said Jessica Wright, acting undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness, in an April 17 statement provided to the Senate Armed Services Committee. But the rosy recruiting environment could be coming to an end as the economy shows “signs of economic improvement, “she said. And if thats not enough of a concern, other factors also are in play. Among them: Fifty-seven percent of parents, teacher, counselors and similar authority figures who influence decisions about enlisting in the military generally dont recommend military service, Wright said. One in five youths ages 12 to 19 is overweight, according to an April 24 statement by Army personnel officials provided to the Senate committee. This compares with one in 20 in 1960. The trend is getting worse, with one in four expected to be overweight by 2015. “A higher number of youths [are] going to college directly from high school,” Wright said — but conversely, Army officials noted that 20 percent of high school students fail to graduate. Graduation, they said, is “a critical milestone in becoming competitive to serve in highly skilled positions” in the military. And, the multiple deployments required over the past decade for many service members raise concerns in service-aged youths that this high operating tempo will continue, Wright said. These concerns have received only passing attention from Congress, apparently because there is no immediate crisis. The Senate Armed Services Committee’s military personnel panel held two hearings recently on military personnel programs, with only one question focusing directly on recruiting. The House Armed Services Committee’s personnel panel does not plan to hold a hearing on recruiting and retention issues before it begins writing its version of the 2014 defense budget in mid-May. Sen. Tim Kaine, D-Va., wondered if the services were “having to do anything unusual or extra” to fill the ranks. Frederick Vollrath, assistant defense secretary for readiness and force management, said, “Currently, recruiting is on track and in good shape,” but he added that the situation easily could change. “We hope that the economy in the United States continues to improve and the unemployment rate continues to go down. That is our fondest wish, along with every other citizen,” Vollrath said. “But, as that occurs, and we believe that will occur, we know by experience that we have to be attuned to the fact that recruiting is probably going to get a little more difficult.” Vollrath also said it’s “sometimes hard to explain” to people outside the military that the force is getting smaller “but we still would like to hire.”

#### Recruitment is key to readiness—necessary for US military effectiveness. Kosiak 08

Steven M. Kosiak, Vice President for Budget Studies at Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments, frequent speaker on defense issues, providing expert testimony before House and Senate Committees, and has been published in multiple major newspapers, “Military Manpower for the Long Haul,” CSBA Publication, 2008

For more than half a century, the US military has been well known for developing and employing the most advanced weapon systems in the world. However, over the years, perhaps nothing has contributed more to the effectiveness of the US military than the quality of its personnel. Indeed, in order to be effective, the US military must have adequate numbers of high-quality military personnel, with the right experience, training and skills. Military manpower requirements can be successfully met only if adequate re- sources are provided for recruitment and retention efforts, including appropriate types and levels of compensation. In addition, success depends on less easily quan- tifiable elements such as effective leadership and intangible but important factors including high morale and the relative success of ongoing military operations. It also requires effective long-term planning. First, because it takes considerable time to produce quality military personnel; and, second, because the military is a closed sys- tem that—with few exceptions—promotes only from within. The US military faces a range of serious challenges to its ability to recruit and retain sufficient numbers of quality personnel both in the near term and over the long term. The most critical near-term challenge is related to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. But these ongoing operations are not the only manpower-related prob- lems confronting the US military. Among other things, those challenges include: Trends in various areas of military technology and concepts of operations that will, over time, likely require that the Services acquire and maintain an increasingly competent, well-trained and well-educated workforce. Obstacles within the Services’ traditional personnel and management cultures that may stand in the way of using the most cost-effective recruitment and reten- tion tools, and creating a more flexible and effective personnel management and compensation system. High and growing budgetary costs associated with military personnel (including the cost of pay and, especially, healthcare and retiree benefits), and the danger that increasing personnel costs may crowd out needed investments in the development and procurement of new weapon systems. Taken together, these and other trends and challenges make it imperative that the Services’ personnel requirements be managed effectively in coming years. Doing so is likely to require both using traditional tools of personnel management (e.g., pay, bo- nuses and recruiting resources) more efficiently and adopting a mix of broader, and in some cases, new and innovative approaches (e.g., restructuring military compensa- tion, and reorienting the military to focus more attention and resources on preparing for stability operations).

#### Readiness prevents great power war and existential governance crises – THIS ISN’T HEG. Startfor ‘13

Stratfor 13. "The Virtues Of Hard Power." Forbes. Forbes Magazine, 22 May 2013. Web. 15 July 2013. Stratfor is a geopolitical intelligence firm that provides strategic analysis and forecasting to individuals and organizations around the world.PL

Hard power has not been in vogue since the Iraq War turned badly in about 2004. In foreign policy journals and at elite conferences, the talk for years has been about “soft power,” “the power of persuasion” and the need to revitalize the U.S. State Department as opposed to the Pentagon: didn’t you know, it’s about diplomacy, not military might! Except when it isn’t; except when members of this same elite argue for humanitarian intervention in places like Libya and Syria. Then soft power be damned. **The fact is that hard power is supremely necessary in today’s world, for reasons having nothing to do with humanitarian intervention**. **Indeed, the Harvard professor and former government official, Joseph S. Nye, Jr.,** who, in 2004, actually coined the term “soft power” in an eponymous book, has always been subtle enough in his own thinking to realize how relevant hard power remains. As I write, **the two areas of the world that are most important in terms of America’s long-term economic and political interests — Asia and Europe — are undergoing power shifts. The growth of Chinese air and naval power is beginning to rearrange the correlation of forces in Asia, while the weakening of the European Union in geopolitical terms – because of its ongoing fiscal crisis — is providing an opportunity for a new Russian sphere of influence to emerge in Central and Eastern Europe**. Of course, both challenges require robust diplomacy on America’s part. But **fundamentally what they really require is a steadfast commitment of American hard power**. And the countries in these two most vital regions are not bashful about saying so**. Security officials in countries as diverse as Japan and Poland, Vietnam and Romania desperately hope that all this talk about American soft power overtaking American hard power is merely that — talk. For it is American warships and ground forces deployments that matter most to these countries and their officials**. Indeed, despite the disappointing conclusions to the Iraq and Afghanistan wars**, rarely before has American hard power been so revered in places that actually matter**. Asia is the world’s demographic and economic hub, as well as the region where the great sea lines of communication coalesce. And unless China undergoes a profound political and economic upheaval — of a degree not yet on the horizon — the Middle Kingdom will present the United States with its greatest 21st century competitor**. In the face of China’s military rise, Japan is shedding its quasi-pacifistic orientation and adopting a positive attitude toward military expansion. In a psychological sense, Japan no longer takes the American air and naval presence in Northeast Asia for granted**. It actively courts American hard power in the face of a territorial dispute with China over islands in the East China Sea. **Japan knows that, ultimately, it is only American hard power that can balance against China in the region. For South Korea, too, American hard power is critical**. **Though the South Korean military can ably defend itself against North Korea’s, again, it is America’s air and naval presence in the region that provides for a favorable balance of power that defends Seoul against Pyongyang and its ally in Beijing**. **As for Taiwan, its very existence as a state depends on the American military’s Pacific presence. Don’t tell officials in the Philippines that American hard power is any less relevant than in previous decades. Like Japan, after years of taking the U.S. Navy and Air Force for granted, Manila is literally desperate for American military support and presence against China, with which it disputes potentially resource-rich islands and geographical features in the South China Sea**. Like Japan and South Korea, the Philippines is a formal treaty ally of the United States: that is to say, these countries matter. As for Taiwan, it is arguably one of the finest examples of a functioning democracy in the world beyond the West, as well as geopolitically vital because of its position on the main sea lines of communication. Thus, Taiwan too, matters greatly. Vietnam, for its part, has emerged as a critical de facto ally of the United States. It is the single most important Southeast Asian country preventing China’s domination of the strategically crucial South China Sea. And what is Vietnam doing? It is refitting Cam Ranh Bay as a deep-water harbor, officially to attract navies from India, Russia and elsewhere; but especially to attract the U.S. Navy. Malaysia plays down its close relationship with the United States, as part of a delicate diplomatic minuet to get along with both China and the Muslim world. Nevertheless, the number of visits of American warships to Malaysian ports has jumped from three annually in 2003 to well over 50. As for Singapore, one of its diplomats told me: “We see American hard power as benign. **The U.S. Navy defends globalization by protecting the sea lanes, which we, more than any other people, benefit from**. To us, there is nothing dark or conspiratorial about the United States and its vast security apparatus.” In 1998, the Singaporeans built Changi Naval Base solely to host American nuclear-powered aircraft carriers and submarines. In 2011, there were 150 American warship visits to Singapore. Then there are the four American littoral combat ships that, it was announced in 2011, would be stationed in Singapore. At the other end of Eurasia, whatever their public comments, diplomats from countries in Central and Eastern Europe are worried about any American shift away from hard power. In the 1990s, the security situation looked benevolent to them. They were in the process of joining NATO and the European Union, even as Russia was weakened by chaos under Boris Yeltsin’s undisciplined rule. Following centuries of interminable warfare, they were finally escaping history, in other words. **Now NATO and the European Union — so vigorous and formidable in the 1990s – look fundamentally infirm. Meanwhile, Russia has been, for the moment, revitalized through a combination of natural gas revenues and Vladimir Putin‘s dynamic authoritarianism-lite**. **Russia once again beckons on the doorstep of Europe, and the Poles, Romanians and others are scared. Forget NATO. With declining defense budgets of almost all European member states, NATO is to be taken less and less seriously.** The **Poles, Romanians and so on now require unilateral U.S. hard power**. For years already, the Poles and Romanians have been participating in U.S. military missions in Afghanistan, Iraq and sub-Saharan Africa. They have been doing so much less because they actually believe in those missions, but in order to prove their mettle as reliable allies of the United States — so that the United States military will be there for them in any future hour of need. As for the Middle East**, Israel, Jordan, Saudi Arabia and the Gulf** countries **all** desperately require U.S. hard power**: If not specifically for an attack on Iran’s nuclear facilities, then certainly** in order to promote a balance of power unfavorable to Iran’s regional hegemony**.** Soft power became a trendy concept in the immediate wake of America’s military overextension in Iraq and Afghanistan. **But soft power was properly meant as a critical accompaniment to hard power and as a shift in emphasis away from hard power, not as a replacement for it. Hard power is best employed not when America invades a country with its ground troops but when it daily projects military might over vast swaths of the earth, primarily with air and naval assets, in order to protect U.S. allies, world trade and a liberal maritime order. American hard power, thus, must never go out of fashion.**

### Part 4 is solvency.

#### First is private sector competition. Obama has capped military personnel wage raises for 2014—means they can’t compete with private sector growth. Newsmax ‘13

Newsmax. Obama Slashes Military Pay Raises; 150 Million Seek to Move to US; NAFTA Hikes Sugar Glut. http://www.newsmax.com/InsiderReport/Obama-Slashes-Military-Raises/2013/09/08/id/524438/

President Obama has told Congress he will cap next year's pay raise for U.S. military personnel at 1 percent instead of boosting pay by 1.8 percent as called for by a federal law. The president's move will negatively impact American combat troops scheduled to remain in Afghanistan through 2014. The federal law says military pay raises must be based on the Employment Cost Index compiled by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, which ties military raises to private sector pay growth. Under that formula, military personnel should be getting a 1.8 percent pay raise beginning in January 2014, CNS News reported. But the law also states that the president can inform Congress of an alternative pay adjustment "if because of national emergency or serious economic conditions affecting the general welfare, the president considers the pay adjustment which would otherwise be required by this section in any year to be inappropriate." Obama wrote to congressional leaders: "I am strongly committed to supporting our uniformed service members, who have made such great contributions to our nation over the past decade of war. As our country continues to recover from serious economic conditions affecting the general welfare, however, we must maintain efforts to keep our nation on a sustainable fiscal course." He also asserted that his decision "will not materially affect the federal government's ability to attract and retain well-qualified members" of the military. The House passed a bill in July authorizing the 1.8 percent raise, but the Senate has set the raise at 1 percent as recommended by Obama. Military pay rose 1.7 percent this year and 1.6 percent in 2012. Retired Air Force Col. Mike Hayden, director of government relations for the Military Officers Association of America (MOAA), calculated that the reduced pay raise could cost an officer with 10 years of service about $52 a month next year, or $8,000 over the remaining years of his or her career. It would also cost a service member $20,000 in retirement pay. Hayden wrote on the MOAA website: "Over the past 12 years, Congress worked hard to fix the 13.5 percent pay gap (and resulting retention problems) caused by repeatedly capping military raises below private-sector pay growth in the 1980s and 1990s. "History has shown that once Congress starts accepting proposals to cap military pay below private-sector growth, pay caps continue until they have weakened retention and readiness."

#### Uniquely high military wages, compared to the private sector, are key to attracting members to the military. Sharp ‘01

James Hosek and Jennifer Sharp. Keeping Military Pay Competitive: The Outlook for Civilian Wage Growth and Its Consequences. http://www.rand.org/pubs/issue\_papers/IP205/index2.html. 2001

Military pay increases for 2001-2006 are mandated by the new legislation to be half a percentage point higher than the annual increase in the Employment Cost Index (ECI). The ECI reflects employment cost growth of the labor force at large. However, the labor force at large does not reflect the composition of military personnel with respect to their age, education, occupation, race/ethnicity, and gender distribution. Recognizing these differences can be important because wages have historically grown at different rates for different demographic groups. If wages for the private-sector groups similar to military personnel grow faster than the ECI, the planned increases in military pay will create less of an edge over private-sector pay. To predict future wage growth for both military personnel and civilians, we analyzed wage data for full-time, full-year workers from Current Population Surveys for 1983-1998. Within six groups defined by gender and race/ethnicity, we estimated models of average wage as a function of age, occupation, education level, unemployment rate, and time trend.[2] Thus, the wage analysis identified long-term wage trends, the cyclical effect of rising and falling unemployment, and wage differences across groups. COLLEGE HAS PAID OFF Figure 1 shows wages for white males ages 22-26 in six occupational groups, holding education constant (high school graduation). The chart shows that wages differ by occupation, with professional/technical occupations being the highest paid and service occupations the lowest paid. Figure 2 shows wages for white males ages 27-31 with varying levels of education, holding their occupation constant (professional/technical). The chart shows that wages differ by education, with college-educated workers being the highest paid. It is well known that wages differ according to education, occupation, age, race/ethnicity, and gender, as illustrated by Figures 1 through 4. However, for military/ civilian pay comparisons we are also interested in how wages have changed over time relative to military pay, so information about wage trends is vital. Figure 1 shows that there has been little wage growth for high school graduates; only professional/technical occupations have a positive wage trend, and it is slight. Figure 2 shows that professional/technical occupations have had substantial wage growth for those with four or more years of college but little wage growth at lower levels of education.Figure 3 summarizes the estimated wage trends for men by race/ethnic group in two occupations (professional/technical and production/craft). Figure 4 does the same for women. The height of the bars represents the average year-to-year change in wages. The wage trends are summarized as a year-to-year change because during the period of analysis the wage trends are typically monotonic and linear, controlling for the business cycle. The other occupational groups have wage trends similar to production/craft and lower than professional/technical. As seen in Figure 3, men’s wages have declined slightly in production/craft and grown in professional/technical occupations. Women’s wages (Figure 4) have tended to rise regardless of occupation, closing part of the male-female wage gap in the civilian sector. Yet again, the largest increase occurs in professional/technical occupations. Men and women have shared equally in the wage gains for those with four or more years of college in professional/technical occupations. fig3 Figure 3—Change in Men’s Real Wages Varied by Occupation We used the results of our current wage analysis to compute past military/civilian pay gaps and forecast future gaps. We compared military pay to the past and projected future distribution of civilian wages, showing where military pay stood as a percentile of civilian wages. To compute military/civilian pay gaps, we created civilian wage and military pay indexes with a common base year and then computed how much one index grew relative to the other.[3] Our civilian wage index weights the private-sector workforce to have the same age, education, gender, race/ethnicity, and occupation group composition as the 1998 Army personnel. We assume that the demographic composition of the Army will remain the same as in 1998. Small changes in personnel force structure will have little effect on the forecasts, but major changes could affect the forecasts. We used actual military pay and civilian wages for 1983-1998 and forecast values for 1999-2010. The forecasts depend on the assumptions about future values of the unemployment rate, ECI, and Consumer Price Index (CPI) presented in Table 1 [4]. fig4 Figure 4—Real Wages Have Increased for Most Women We used basic pay as representative of military pay.[5] Basic pay forecasts incorporate the provisions of the FY 2000 pay legislation, i.e., the 4.8 percent increase in January 2000, the pay-cell-specific increases in July 2000, and the ECI + 0.5 percentage point increases in 2001-2006. The CPI values must also be considered so that future basic pay is deflated to 1998 dollars in keeping with the civilian wage forecasts. And unemployment rate forecasts allow us to account for the effect of changes in economic activity on civilian wages. For example, the wage analysis found that a decrease in the unemployment rate from 6 percent to 5 percent is associated with a $10 per week—or $500 per year—increase in the wages of 22- to 26-year-old, high school graduate, white males who work full time, year round. Forecasts with more dire unemployment futures than the Congressional Budget Office outlook showed slower civilian wage growth and a higher military/civilian wage ratioOur civilian wage forecasts assume that the wage trends observed for 1983-1998 will continue. This is a strong assumption. We looked in the economics and business literature for reinforcement of our assumption or evidence that it was erroneous, but we found no other wage predictions for our groups. Still, it should be noted that under certain circumstances wage trends could change. For example, over the long term, changes in relative wages are influenced by changes in relative supplies of workers. This means that if the supply of college-educated workers increases, their wages may decline or increase at a lower rate than in the past two decades. And a decrease in the supply of high school-educated workers could possibly stop the decline in their wages and lead to rising wages. In addition, if wages for civilian college graduates increase more slowly than we forecast, then officer pay will hold its own and the gap between officer pay and private-sector pay will close more rapidly than we report below. Also, if wages for the civilian high school graduate rise more rapidly, then the pay gap between civilian high school graduates and enlisted personnel will be smaller. Finally, we do not adjust for unobserved factors that might affect wage levels or trends. For instance, the rise in college enrollments may deplete the high school-only group of young people with greater aptitude and motivation because they would be among those enrolling in college. This would contribute to the observed decline in the wages of this group because those left in the group presumably would be of lesser aptitude and motivation and so would probably earn less. Similarly, the addition of these greater-aptitude high school graduates to the some-college group might reduce the average aptitude and motivation of the some-college group, leading to a slower increase in wages than if the composition of the group had been held constant. JUNIOR ENLISTED PAY IMPROVED THE MOST; OFFICERS GAIN BUT GAP REMAINS In Figure 5, the bars represent the pay gaps (as defined in footnote 3) between military personnel and their counterparts in the private sector. A negative bar in this graph indicates that pay in the military has grown more slowly than in the civilian sector; a positive bar indicates that it has grown more rapidly. The findings, as illustrated in the graph, confirm earlier RAND research that during the 1980s and 1990s, military pay growth for enlisted personnel kept pace with or outpaced civilian pay growth, relative to a starting point of 1982. Pay growth for officers lagged civilian pay growth, however.[6] fig5 Figure 5—Pay Outlook Is Expected to Improve, Especially for Enlisted Cyclical effects are also apparent. Civilian wage growth decreased during the economic slowdown at the beginning of the 1990s, causing the pay gap to improve (military pay rose relative to civilian pay). During the economic expansion in the 1990s, civilian pay rose faster than military pay, worsening the pay gap. Looking to the future, officers’ military pay will rise faster than civilian pay, causing the negative pay gap to diminish, although a negative gap will remain. Pay for enlisted personnel will also rise. The rise will overcome the decline in military pay during the economic boom and then reach still-higher values. In other results, we found that the pay outlook will improve more for enlisted personnel with five or fewer years of service than for those with more years of service, whom we assume to have the equivalent of some college, e.g., a year or two. Basic pay will grow at the same rate for both men and women, but military pay relative to civilian pay will not rise as rapidly for enlisted women as for enlisted men because the corresponding civilian wages are growing faster for women. Junior and senior officers will have a pay gap pattern similar to that for officers overall, with their current large negative gap diminishing but still remaining negative. Pay gap forecasts capture the general pay trends relevant to military personnel, but they do not show how military pay compares to the dollar value of civilian pay. For this reason, we also compared the military compensation of junior enlisted personnel and senior officers to the wage percentiles of their civilian counterparts (Figures 6 and 7). In this case, we measured military compensation as basic pay plus housing and subsistence allowances, including the tax advantage that arises because the allowances are not federally taxable. Figures 6 and 7 designate this line as “RMC” (Regular Military Compensation). fig6 Figure 6—RMC for Junior Enlisted Shows Large Gain For junior enlisted personnel with a high school education, military compensation is projected to exceed the 80th civilian wage percentile during the decade.[7] This increase in military compensation occurs because under the FY 2000 pay package, military pay will rise faster than the ECI. With low inflation, this will cause real military compensation (i.e., in 1998 dollars) to rise. In contrast, based on our wage analysis, the real wages of civilian male high school graduates are expected to continue their past trend and decline. In addition, the economy is expected to soften, further reducing the pay of civilian male high school graduates.[8] We should add two caveats. In the late 1990s the wages of high school graduates spurted up along with those of everyone else (thus the wage spike in Figure 6). Although our wage analysis data end in 1998, the strong economy has probably kept the wages of high school graduates unusually high. Our forecasts for 1999 and 2000 are based on the long-term trend and are no doubt below the actual wage values. Further, as mentioned (footnote 5), the shift from BMC to RMC in 1998 falsely exaggerates the increase in military compensation at that time. One can visually adjust for this. Instead of relying on the 1999 and 2000 wage forecasts, we could assume that the 1998 civilian wage peak continues to date. Even with these changes, it remains likely that military compensation is likely to exceed the 80th percentile of wages for civilian high school graduates during the decade. fig7 Figure 7—Officer RMC Will Rise, Then Keep Pace with Market Pay Military compensation for officers will increase in the next few years, nearing the 70th percentile of the civilian wage distribution and likely remaining there much of the decade. This will help return officer pay to its early-1980s position in the civilian wage distribution. Still, visually adjusting the RMC line places officer compensation below the 70th percentile. As for continued wage growth, during 1999 and 2000 actual pay growth has probably remained high, at values implied by a continuation of its trend. The 1999 and 2000 wage forecasts thus may be fairly accurate, rather than low as in the case of junior enlisted personnel. If the college wage trend weakens in the future, RMC will rise to a higher percentile than shown in Figure 7. TAKING A LONGER VIEW: COMPARING PAY OVER MILITARY VERSUS CIVILIAN CAREERS Given these findings, it seems clear that the FY 2000 pay package is a major step toward restoring military pay to levels that will help the services sustain a high-quality enlisted and officer force in the future. But the current pay comparisons may be misleading because they hold education constant and overlook the education-related component of career decisionmaking. For example, if pay at entry is the same in two careers but is expected to grow faster in one career than the other, the higher-paying career is likely to be chosen. A more subtle difference comes from an individual’s opportunity to move to a new career track by getting more education. In particular, many of the men and women the military would like to attract and retain are also considering whether, and when, to get additional education. From a policy perspective, it is therefore important to be aware of the incentives for getting further education and understand how they are influencing career choices. To address this topic, we look at the present value of different education/occupation choices and see how they have changed over time relative to the present value of a military career. We first present some illustrative age-earnings profiles and then show the present values of different careers. fig8 Figure 8—Earnings Start Later and Grow Faster for Military and Civilian College Graduates Figures 8 and 9 show age-earnings profiles for 20-year careers for three different cohorts: persons age 19 in 1983, 1998, and 2006, respectively. [9] Earnings for the 1983 cohort reflect actual earnings through 1998 and forecast earnings afterward. The future earnings of the 1998 and 2006 cohorts are entirely forecast. The military profiles are based on Army average promotion times for the middle to late 1990s. The 1983 line shows actual BMC to 1998 and forecasted RMC in later years. The forecast includes the FY 2000 pay increases. On the Army chart, there are two 1998 lines: the lower line is the expected pay profile in the absence of the FY 2000 pay boost, and the upper line includes the pay boost. The 2006 line is set when the final element of the FY 2000 pay package has taken effect (Employment Cost Index plus 0.5 percent). For 2007 and beyond, military pay grows by the same percentage as the Employment Cost Index, assumed at 2.5 percent per year. In Figure 8, on the left, we clearly see the upward shift in the pay profile for a person with four or more years of college in a professional/technical occupation. The upward shift is caused by the growth in returns to college. Military pay for officers has also grown; hence the officer pay lines on the chart on the right shift up too. fig9 Figure 9—Enlisted Pay Growth Is Steeper Than for High School Graduates in Civilian Jobs Figure 9 depicts age-earnings pay for a production/ craft worker with a high school education. Production/ craft is the most common occupation for civilian high school-educated male workers. As seen, earnings decline from cohort to cohort. In contrast, military pay shifts upward and after the first few years of service is well above civilian pay. Although these results make the military career seem extraordinarily attractive, it would be a mistake to jump to that conclusion. First, throughout the history of the volunteer force it has been necessary to pay an above-average wage to attract enough high-quality recruits. So, as mentioned above, our analysis emphasizes not just levels of pay but changes in military and civilian pay over time and their relation to each other.

#### Empirically proven—volunteers are low-income workers. Gifford ‘06

Brian Gifford, RAND Institute, The Camouflaged Safety Net: The U.S. Armed Forces as Welfare State Institution, Published by Oxford University Press Social Politics: International Studies in Gender, State & Society 2006 13(3):372-399; doi:10.1093/sp/jxl003 http://sp.oxfordjournals.org/cgi/content/full/13/3/372?maxtoshow=&HITS=10&hits=10&RESULTFORMAT=&searchid=1&FIRSTINDEX=0&resourcetype=HWCIT

What becomes clear from this analysis is that expanding the welfare state concept to include state institutions, programs, and policies that provide benefits to individuals or remove them from the competitive workforce increases the potential for explaining the intersections of the state, labor markets, and public social provision. Such a reconceptualization alsoallows for cross-polity comparisons of the relative effectivenessof social welfare strategies. Volunteers who fill the ranks of the U.S. military by no means represent a cross-section of the general population. They are more likely to come from the lower socioeconomic strata and are disproportionately AfricanAmerican (Segal and Verdugo 1994; Moskos and Butler 1996). New recruits and career service members may view the military as a refuge against inhospitable labor market conditions, rather than one among many equally desirable employment opportunities.Investigation in this area may prove useful in both probingconceptions of de-commodification more deeply and understandingsocial assistance recipients themselves—those who makeclaims on the state based on their status of poverty, ratherthan demanding their social rights as full citizens. It may well be the case that in the United States the less-privileged strata of society often circumvent both commodification and the stigma of "welfare" through attachments to the armed forces and thus compare favorably with social welfare recipients in other Western industrialized nations. This may be particularlytrue of African Americans, who are overrepresented in both thearmed forces and social assistance programs such as TANF andunderrepresented in the workplace.

#### Second is work disincentive. Low wages kill military readiness—financial strains prevent effective mission operation. Leitsinger ‘14

MIRANDA LEITSINGER. Hungry Heroes: 25 Percent of Military Families Seek Food Aid. 2014. http://www.nbcnews.com/feature/in-plain-sight/hungry-heroes-25-percent-military-families-seek-food-aid-n180236

Defense Department spokesman Lt. Cmdr. Nate Christensen said in a statement on Friday that the Pentagon was reviewing the survey and was “concerned with anything that impacts the wellness and readiness of service members and families. The work of Feeding America and other organizations will help the department amplify the DOD resources available to service members and families, particularly in high-cost locations.” He added that the Pentagon “recognizes that personal financial readiness of service members and their families must be maintained to sustain mission readiness” and offers personal financial management counselors, as well as other tools and services, to help personnel get a clear understanding of their finances. Military stores – like exchanges and commissaries – provide savings to troops, he said. (On Monday, the Pentagon issued a new statement on the survey, saying: "The Department of Defense disagrees with the methodology that Feeding America used to calculate the estimated percentage of military households served by its food assistance programs.") Spikes in food aid sought by active duty service members, reservists, guardsmen and veterans emerged in states with large military bases, like in Delaware, California, Texas, Colorado, Georgia, Washington and Virginia, according to Feeding America data from its "Hunger in America 2014" report, a national study it runs every four years. Other surges came in states where a lot of people join the military, like Iowa, and then return home after being discharged. More than 60,000 clients of the organization’s network and 32,000 of its partner agencies participated in the survey. Operation Homefront, a nonprofit focusing on the lowest-paid enlisted service members, wounded warriors and their families, said requests for food assistance from people they serve tripled starting in 2009 and have only slightly receded since then. Adding to the financial strain for military families, the Defense Department this year issued its lowest pay raise – 1 percent - in 50 years, according to the Military Officers Association of America, a nonpartisan nonprofit focused on military personnel matters, and it will seek the same level from Congress through 2017. Limiting the pay increase came after Congress in 2000 passed a law to redress the salary gap between civilians and the military, which was then at 13.5 percent, the association said. The new pay cap hurts retention and readiness, particularly impacting young military families already living on tight budgets, said Army Col. Mike Barron (Ret.), the association’s deputy director of government relations. “It’s going to cause them (soldiers) to not be as focused on their job at hand and a lot of the jobs that we have, lives depend on them being focused,” he said. The financial hardships translate into “more stress on the force, more stress on the service member, more stress on their family,” he added.

#### And, the Us DoD features monopsonistic competition—controls the demand for its specific labor force. Asch ‘08

Beth Asch Paul Heaton. Monopsony and Labor Supply in the Army and Navy. October 2008. PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

A growing research literature provides empirical evidence of monopsonistic behavior by firms in the labor market (Boal and Ransom 1997). An appealing feature of the monopsony model is its ability to explain empirical regularities that are difficult to reconcile using a purely competitive framework. Monopsony has been used as a basis of explaining positive employment effects of minimum wages (Card 1992), inversions in the wage-tenure profile (Ransom 1993), and the gender wage gap (Manning 2003). Perhaps the most obvious approach to establishing monopsonistic behavior is to estimate the labor supply curve for a monopsonistic firm and demonstrate that supply elasticities are less than infinite. As a practical matter, however, estimating supply elasticities has proven challenging, both because of difficulties in identifying settings in which monopsony is likely to occur, and because of data constraints that make it difficult to cleanly separate supply from demand. In this paper, we consider the U.S. labor market for defense services, which provides an obvious candidate for monopsony because the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD) is the sole legal employer of military personnel. We draw from a unique database on wages and enlistments for the Army and Navy to estimate the wagesetting power of the U.S. military. Although new military recruits represent a fairly small component of the overall young adult labor market, the DoD remains an important national employer, particularly for high school graduates who do not wish to immediately matriculate into college. In FY2006, across the active component of all services the DoD hired roughly 180,000 new personnel, almost 90% of whom were under age 25. Total active force size was approximately 1.35 million. However, despite its potential to provide interesting insights regarding non-competitive employer behavior, relatively few existing studies specifically address the military as a monopsonist. In an early contribution, Borcherding (1971) argues that monopsonistic behavior will lead to the underprovision of personnel for the military and deadweight loss, although he makes no attempt to quantify the extent of the welfare effect. Cooper (1975) considers includes monposonistic deadweight loss as one component in his comparison of the volunteer to the conscripted force. Quester and Nakada (1983) present a model of the military as a dominant-firm monopsonist and combine their model with existing estimated to calculate welfare losses comprising 10-15% of total D.O.D. wage expenditures.

#### This means no negative effect on employment—wage increases specifically in monopsonistic industries increase overall employment. Giuliano ‘13

Laura Giuliano. Minimum Wage Effects on Employment, Substitution, and the Teenage Labor Supply: Evidence from Personnel Data. Journal of Labor Economics, Vol. 31, No. 1 (January 2013), pp. 155-194

A positive employment effect from a moderately binding minimum wage is consistent with two sets of models that incorporate labor market frictions. Monopsony models show that a wage floor can produce higher employment by compelling employers to move up their labor supply curves. A second set of models predicts that a minimum wage can generate higher labor demand by inducing labor market entry. Modern models of dynamic monopsony (Burdett and Mortensen 1998; Manning 2003) and monopsonistic competition (Bhaskar and To 1999) show that even if there are many firms in a market, firms can exercise monopsony power and a minimum wage can cause them to employ more labor. 32 These models assume that wage competition between employers is imperfect, either because job seekers have imperfect information or because they care about workplace location and other distinctive nonwage job attributes. In this context, the increase in firm-level employment may come from two sources. First, firms employ more people who previously were not employed because their reservation wages exceeded the monopsony wage. Second, the employment of some firms may grow at the expense of others. This could happen either because low-wage firms lose fewer workers to higher wage firms (Burdett and Mortensen 1998) or because some firms may expand as others exit the market (Bhaskar and To 1999).33

### Underview

#### First, AFF Gets RVIs- if I win that there is no abuse or offense to a counter interp, I should win the round. Prefer this interp for 2 reasons:

1. **Time skew: Theory makes the 6 minute AC useless and only leaves me 7 minutes of speaking time, which supercharges the already existing 7-4-6 time skew. And, the 6 minute 2NR time split means neg can go all in substance and theory, giving aff no chance to cover every layer in the 2AR. Time skew is key to fairness because if I don’t have time to make arguments, the arguments I have access to don’t matter.**
2. **Reciprocity: My opponent has quantitatively more ways to reach the ballot. They can win through either winning substance or theory while I have to do both in order to win. And, the neg always gets bidirectional theory ground whereas the aff speaks in the dark, so they always have an structural advantage. Reciprocity is key to fairness because absent reciprocal burdens, one side gets far easier access to the ballot.**

#### Second, solutions to critical issues must be discussed through pragmatic approaches within hegemonic power structures. Kapoor ‘08

Kapoor, 2008 (Ilan, Associate Professor at the Faculty of Environmental Studies, York University, “The Postcolonial Politics of Development,” p. 138-139)

There are perhaps several other social movement campaigns that could be cited as examples of a ‘hybridizing strategy’.5 But what emerges as important from the Chipko and NBA campaigns is the way in which they treat laws and policies, institutional practices, and ideological apparatuses as deconstructible. That is, they refuse to take dominant authority at face value, and proceed to reveal its contingencies. Sometimes, they expose what the hegemon is trying to disavow or hide (exclusion of affected communities in project design and implementation, faulty information gathering and dissemination). Sometimes, they problematize dominant or naturalized truths (‘development = unlimited economic growth = capitalism’, ‘big is better’, ‘technology can save the environment’). In either case, by contesting, publicizing, and politicizing accepted or hidden truths, they hybridize power, challenging its smugness and triumphalism, revealing its impurities. They show power to be, literally and figuratively, a bastard. While speaking truth to power, a hybridizing strategy also exploits the instabilities of power. In part, this involves showing up and taking advantage of the equivocations of power — conflicting laws, contradictory policies, unfulfilled promises. A lot has to do here with publicly shaming the hegemon, forcing it to remedy injustices and live up to stated commitments in a more accountable and transparent manner. And, in part, this involves nurturing or manipulating the splits and strains within institutions. Such maneuvering can take the form of cultivating allies, forging alliances, or throwing doubt on prevailing orthodoxy. Note, lastly, the way in which a hybridizing strategy works with the dominant discourse. This reflects the negotiative aspect of Bhabha’s performativity. The strategy may outwit the hegemon, but it does so from the interstices of the hegemony. The master may be paralyzed, but his paralysis is induced using his own poison/medicine. It is for this reason that cultivating allies in the adversarial camp is possible: when you speak their language and appeal to their own ethical horizons, you are building a modicum of common ground. It is for this reason also that the master cannot easily dismiss or crush you. Observing his rules and playing his game makes it difficult for him not to take you seriously or grant you a certain legitimacy. The use of non-violent tactics may be crucial in this regard: state repression is easily justified against violent adversaries, but it is vulnerable to public criticism when used against non-violence. Thus, the fact that Chipko and the NBA deployed civil disobedience — pioneered, it must be pointed out, by the ‘father of the nation’ (i.e. Gandhi) — made it difficult for the state to quash them or deflect their claims.

#### Third, PICs Bad

#### Strat Skew- the CP steals some if not all of the AC offense. The 1AR can’t leverage offense against the CP because there is nothing to leverage. This forces the affirmative to generate new offense starting from the 1AR in which the affirmative must leverage 4 minutes of offense against 13 which will always put the affirmative at a disadvantage. Strat skew is key to fairness, because if a debater cannot form a coherent strategy, winning is impossible.

#### Predictability- they could do the AC advocacy minus one person, dollar, crime, etc. and claim an obscure net benefit. This is bad for debate in terms of fairness because a) it makes it impossible for the aff to predict a neg strategy when there are potentially infinite numbers of PIC options and b) running PICs provides no limit to the ability of negatives to hijack aff ground.

### Util FW Underview

#### First, the act-omission distinction doesn’t exist since inactions are still intentional choices. Rachels

James Rachels. “Killing and Letting Die.” http://www.jamesrachels.org/killing.pdf

So what is the difference between causing and allowing? What real difference is marked by those words? The most obvious ways of attempting to draw the distinction won’t work. For example, suppose we say it is the difference between action and inaction--when we cause an outcome, we do something, but when we merely allow it to happen, we passively stand by and do nothing. This won’t work because, when we allow something to happen, we do perform at least one act: the act of allowing it to happen. The problem is that the distinction between doing something and not doing something is relative to the specification of what is or is not done--if I allow someone to die, I do not save him, but I do let him die. It is tempting to say the difference between action and inaction is the difference between moving one’s body and not moving one’s body; but that does not help. When we allow something to happen, we are typically moving our bodies in all sorts of ways. If I allow you to die by running away, I may be moving my body very rapidly.

#### If there is no act-omission distinction, then we are fully complicit with any harm we allow, which justifies util because we are morally culpable for every instance.

#### Second, moral status is based on scalar degrees, i.e. lying and killing have different degrees of wrongness. However, deontic judgments are purely binary since it does not compare between violations of side constraints. Only util bridges the ethical inconsistency because it can say one state of affairs is worse than another. Alexander

Larry Alexander, “Scalar Properties, Binary Judgments,” Journal of Applied Philosophy 25 (2008).

In the moral realm, our deontic judgments are usually (always?) binary. An act (or omission) is either morally forbidden or morally permissible. Yet the determination of an act’s deontic status frequently turns on the existence of properties that are matters of degree. In what follows I shall give several examples of binary moral judgments that turn on scalar properties, and I shall claim that these examples should puzzle us. How can the existence of a property to a specific degree demarcate a boundary between an act’s being morally forbidden and its not being morally forbidden? Why aren’t our moral judgments of acts scalar in the way that the properties on which those judgments are based are scalar, so that acts, like states of affairs, can be morally better or worse rather than right or wrong? I conceive of this inquiry as operating primarily within the realm of normative theory. Presumably it will give aid and comfort to consequentialists, who have no trouble mapping their binary categories onto scalar properties. For example, a straightforward act utilitarian, for whom one act out of all possible acts is morally required (and hence permissible) and all others morally forbidden, can, in theory at least, provide an answer to every one of the puzzles I raise. And, in theory, so can all other types of act and rule consequentialists. They will find nothing of interest here beyond embarrassment for their deontological adversaries. The deontologists, however, must meet the challenges of these puzzles. And for them, the puzzles may raise not just normative questions, but questions of moral epistemology and moral ontology. Just how do we know that the act consequentialist’s way of, say, trading off lives against lives is wrong? For example, do we merely intuit that taking one innocent, uninvolved person’s life to save two others is wrong? Can our method of reflective equilibrium work if we have no theory to rationalize our intuitions? And what things in the world make it true, if it is true, that one may not make the act consequentialist’s tradeoff? I do not provide any answers to these questions any more than I provide answers to the normative ones. But they surely lurk in the background.

## 1AR

### AT Heg Bad (Top Level)

#### 1. The pursuit of heg is inevitable – it’s just a question of effectiveness. Tellis ’09,

Tellis, senior associate at Carnegie, 9 — Ashley J. Tellis, Senior Associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace specializing in international security, defense and Asian strategic issues, Research Director of the Strategic Asia program at NBR—the National Bureau of Asian Research, holds a Ph.D. from the University of Chicago, 2009 (“Preserving Hegemony: The Strategic Tasks Facing the United States,” Global Asia, Volume 4, Number 1, Available Online at http://globalasia.org/pdf/issue9/Ashley\_J.\_Tellis.pdf, Accessed 09-13-2011, p. 54-55) recut from Woodward

This hegemony is by no means fated to end any ¶ time soon, however, given that the United States ¶ remains predominant by most conventional indicators of national power. The character of the ¶ United States’ hegemonic behavior in the future ¶ will thus remain an issue of concern both within ¶ the domestic polity and internationally. Yet the ¶ juvenescence of the United State’s “unipolar ¶ moment,” combined with the disorientation ¶ produced by the September 11 attacks, ought to ¶ restrain any premature generalization that the ¶ imperial activism begun by the clinton administration, and which the Bush administration took ¶ to its most spirited apotheosis, would in some ¶ way come to define the permanent norm of US ¶ behavior in the global system. In all probability, ¶ it is much more likely that the limitations on US ¶ ¶ power witnessed in Afghanistan and Iraq will ¶ produce a more phlegmatic and accommodating United States over the longer term, despite ¶ the fact that the traditional US pursuit of dominance — understood as the quest to maintain a ¶ preponderance of power, neutralize threatening ¶ challengers, and protect freedom of action, goals ¶ that go back to the foundations of the republic — ¶ is unlikely to be extinguished any time soon.¶ Precisely because the desire for dominance is ¶ likely to remain a permanent feature of US geopolitical ambitions — even though how it is exercised will certainly change in comparison to ¶ the Bush years — the central task facing the next ¶ administration will still pertain fundamentally ¶ to the issue of US power. This concern manifests ¶ itself through the triune challenges of: redefining ¶ the United States’ role in the world, renewing the ¶ foundations of US strength, and recovering the ¶ legitimacy of US actions. In other words, the next ¶ administration faces the central task of clarifying ¶ the character of US hegemony, reinvigorating the ¶ material foundations of its power, and securing ¶ international support for its policies.

#### That non-uniques all of their evidence, multiple warrants

#### A. Their systems compare a multi-polar world to unipolar one with no warrant for why we’d transition away from a unipolar system. The aff doesn’t strengthen or weaken heg, but simply makes it more effective at resolving and preventing within a unipolar system.

#### B. Their evidence is based on perception, i.e. that the United States will receive backlash for its position of power, but that’s non-unique because the aff changes nothing about the push for US power, means they’re non-unique. Squo uses current focus on military so they have no impact.

#### 2. Their evidence identifies the need for the aff – their impacts are based on studies of declining hegemonies that are no longer strong enough to maintain peace, aff ensures effective military and avoids the impacts of their evidence.

#### The two arguments above are high-level, winning either of those disproves the entirety of the link to their heg cards – the rest of the arguments are even if they prove a link.

#### 3. The US won’t give up the crown- we’ll go down fighting triggering all their impacts- hegemony critics agree. Calleo ‘9,

David P. Calleo (University Professor at The Johns Hopkins University and Dean Acheson Professor at its Nitze School of Advanced International Studies (SAIS)) 2009 “Follies of Power: America’s Unipolar Fantasy” p. 4-5

It is tempting to believe that America’s recent misadventures will discredit and suppress our hegemonic longings and that, following the presidential election of 2008, a new administration will abandon them. But so long as our identity as a nation is intimately bound up with seeing ourselves as the world’s most powerful country, at the heart of a global system, hegemony is likely to remain the recurring obsession of our official imagination, the id´ee fixe of our foreign policy. America’s hegemonic ambitions have, after all, suffered severe setbacks before. Less than half a century has passed since the “lesson of Vietnam.” But that lesson faded without forcing us to abandon the old fantasies of omnipotence. The fantasies merely went into remission, until the fall of the Soviet Union provided an irresistible occasion for their return. Arguably, in its collapse, the Soviet Union proved to be a greater danger to America’s own equilibrium than in its heyday. Dysfunctional imaginations are scarcely a rarity – among individuals or among nations. “Reality” is never a clear picture that imposes itself from without. Imaginations need to collaborate. They synthesize old and new images, concepts, and ideas and fuse language with emotions – all according to the inner grammar of our minds. These synthetic constructions become our reality, our way of depicting the world in which we live. Inevitably, our imaginations present us with only a partial picture. As Walter Lippmann once put it, our imaginations create a “pseudo-environment between ourselves and the world.”2 Every individual, therefore, has his own particular vision of reality, and every nation tends to arrive at a favored collective view that differs from the favored view of other nations. When powerful and interdependent nations hold visions of the world severely at odds with one another, the world grows dangerous.

#### 4. A decline in heg would trigger drastic measures from the White House – means even if the aff is a bad idea, declining heg now would cause more extremist policies to attempt to maintain heg. Gottileb 9/19,

Gottlieb 9/19—adjunct professor of International Affairs and Public Policy at the School of International and Public Affairs, Columbia University, two MA degrees and a PhD in international relations from Columbia (Stuart, 9/19/12, “What if U.S. stops policing the world?,” http://www.cnn.com/2012/09/18/opinion/gottlieb-us-retrenchment/index.html, RBatra)

But the question is not whether promises to bring home troops and reduce military spending can be sold in an election year -- the question is what impact would retrenchment have on future U.S. and global security. If history is any guide, the answer is troubling: Over the past century, each of America's attempts to reduce its role in the world was met by rising global threats, eventually requiring a major U.S. re-engagement.¶ This is not to argue that the U.S. should sustain its muscular post-9/11 global posture or continue its land war in Afghanistan. It is to urge caution against a growing belief that scaling back American power in the world will be without risks or costs.¶ History shows that in the aftermath of America's major wars of the 20th century -- World War I, World War II and Vietnam -- the American public and powerful leaders in Washington demanded strict new limits in foreign policy. After World War I, that meant rejecting participation in the League of Nations and receding into isolation. After World War II, it meant embarking on one of the largest voluntary military demobilizations in world history. And after Vietnam, it meant placing new restrictions on a president's ability to conduct overseas operations.¶ But in each case, hopes were soon dashed by global challengers who took advantage of America's effort to draw back from the world stage -- Germany and Japan in the 1930s, the Soviet Union in the immediate post-World War II period and the Soviet Union again after Vietnam. In each case, the United States was forced back into a paramount global leadership role -- in World War II, the Cold War and the military build-up and proxy wars of the 1980s.¶ Similar effects have also followed the withdrawal of U.S. troops from global hot spots, as in Somalia in 1993. America's need to extricate itself from that calamitous humanitarian mission, in which 18 U.S. soldiers were killed, was clear. But the withdrawal came at a huge strategic cost: It emboldened the narrative of the emerging al Qaeda network that America was a "paper tiger," setting the stage for the escalating terrorist attacks of the 1990s and September 11, 2001.¶ Obama's desire to withdraw from costly and unpopular foreign conflicts and refocus on domestic issues is understandable. And he is by no means an isolationist, as his intensified war on al Qaeda can attest.¶ But Obama's assertion that his recalibration of U.S. foreign policy -- centered on withdrawing U.S. troops from Mideast wars and leaning more on allies and the United Nations -- has awakened "a new confidence in our leadership" is without foundation.¶ Like Great Britain in the 19th century, America since the turn of the 20th century has been the world's pivotal global power. Fair or not, in moments when America seemed unsure of its role in the world, the world noticed and reacted.¶ There is no reason to believe now is different. Indeed, in many ways looming opportunists are more obvious today than the 1930s, 1970s and 1990s. These include al Qaeda and other Islamist movements spinning U.S. troop withdrawals from Iraq and Afghanistan as strategic defeats; an emboldened Iran on the cusp of attaining nuclear weapons; and a rising China flexing its muscles in the South China Sea.

### AT Heg Bad (Disease)

#### 1. Hegemony is key to prevent disease – that would disproportionately affect the non-western world – overwhelms rudimentary healthcare system. Meier ’10,

Meier ’10 – Asst. Professor of Global Health Policy @ UNC Chapel Hill (Benjamin Mason, The Obama Administration’s Global Health Initiative: Public Health Law, U.S. Foreign Policy & Universal Human Rights, Public Health Law, 2010)

Global health is fast becoming an explicit goal of U.S. policy – with legislation, regulations, and policy statements guiding our funding, activities, and programs to address public health abroad. At the intersection of foreign policy and health policy, this global health imperative for public health law is poised to grow under the Obama Administration’s Global Health Initiative. With contemporary institutions of global health governance now over 60 years old, the nature of the global health architecture has changed considerably as the United States has shifted its global health priorities.[i] As a leading progenitor of the global health governance framework, the United States has long sought a place for global health policy to alleviate suffering in an increasingly interconnected world. However, with U.S. policymakers harboring suspicions that global governance would advance “socialized medicine” in the midst of the Cold War, the United States constrained international organizations to medical “impact projects” that would advance U.S. foreign policy interests.[ii] Despite fleeting U.S. support for global health policy in the 1970s,[iii] the 1980 election of President Reagan—and with it, principled opposition to international organizations—would limit opportunities for global health governance.[iv] Given a growing leadership vacuum in global health, the global health architecture began to shift toward greater U.S. hegemony in global health policy, with scholars increasingly noting that “the U.S. domestic agenda is driving the global agenda.”[v] Moving away from a model of working through international institutions for global health governance, the United States is bypassing multilateral organizations and pursuing a herculean expansion in bilateral health assistance, increasingly making U.S. foreign policy a singular force for global health.[vi] As the largest donor to global health—in absolute dollars, albeit less committed relative to GDP—foreign health assistance is fast becoming an anchor of U.S. soft power – answering the call for global health leadership in a post-Cold War world.[vii] Where once this role was defined by uncoordinated medical approaches to select high-profile diseases, the United States is moving toward coordinated foreign assistance to public health systems. With U.S. health diplomacy once grounded solely in the containment of the Cold War—to combat the “unsatisfactory living conditions on which Communism feeds,” influencing minds as much as bodies[viii]—the 1961 establishment of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) galvanized foreign assistance for public health, administering technical and economic assistance for the provision of health services.[ix] However, even as extended by President Bush’s 2003 Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief (PEPFAR), these ambitious global health commitments would be criticized for excessive reliance on medical services and for “crowding out” public health systems in the developing world.[x] In spite of burgeoning efforts to address HIV, malaria, and tuberculosis, these fragmented U.S. efforts continued to lack coordination across government agencies, attention to health systems, and strategy for foreign assistance. But as ethical claims and human rights have renewed attention to the plight of the world’s poor,[xi] the United States has moved to coordinate foreign assistance for global health. Given the need for a comprehensive strategy to govern U.S. engagement with global health[xii]—a need that grew dire as the global financial crisis decimated global health[xiii]—the Institute of Medicine (IOM) recommended that the United States engage more deliberately in global health leadership.[xiv] To reshape foreign health assistance across U.S. agencies, programs, and partners, the Obama Administration’s Global Health Initiative (GHI) seeks to develop a unified global health strategy to integrate and organize U.S. global health efforts. Focusing on public health systems (specifically health financing, information management, and workforce capacity-building institutions)—adding onto existing disease-specific efforts (with 70% of funds earmarked for PEPFAR, notwithstanding a stabilization in HIV funding)—the GHI seeks to shape how the U.S. government coordinates its resources across global health activities and engages with developing countries in meeting nine targets for global health (delineated in figure 1), achieving these targets through seven key principles (delineated in figure 2).[xv] While it is unclear to what extent this foreign policy effort will meet its targets and principles for health system strengthening, preliminary coordination among agencies has begun to identify areas in which the United States could have the greatest sustainable impact on public health outcomes.[xvi] With $63 billion requested for this Initiative over a six year period, the GHI will seek to prioritize country-led efforts to reach the most effective and efficient improvements for public health systems. These changes in U.S. policy will greatly influence disease prevention and health promotion throughout the world, with public health lawyers holding key positions in shaping this policy. With an imperative to create policy frameworks to guide our innovative programs in global health, the need has never been greater to rethink how we in public health law endeavor to meet global health needs – viewing ourselves as key actors in the global health architecture and viewing our work as medicine on a global scale.

#### 2. US leadership solves global disease spread. ONE ‘10

ONE 10 (ONE, advocacy organization committed to the fight against extreme poverty and preventable disease, “American Leadership: A healthier, more prosperous World.” Pg 2) PDF

**Thanks to US leadership**, the tools to prevent and treat HIV/AIDS, TB and malaria are affordable, effective, and saving millions of lives each year. Nearly four million Africans—up from 50,000 in 2002—are now receiving antiretroviral treatment for HIV/AIDS. Malaria programs have reached 25 million people with prevention and treatment measures. The Global Fund has also treated more than 7 million people for tuberculosis since 2002. But there’s still much more we must do. In 2008, HIV/AIDS killed 2 million people, 1.4 million in Africa alone. Malaria kills roughly 900,000 people every year—mostly children and pregnant women in sub-Saharan Africa—with 6.7 million people still in need of effective treatment worldwide. And tuberculosis killed nearly 1.3 million people in 2008, with 90 percent of cases affecting the world’s poorest. America’s investments have changed—and saved—millions of lives, one person at a time. This is no time to stop. Every year, nearly 343,000 mothers die giving birth. Most of these women live in the world’s poorest countries. Women in sub-Saharan Africa, for example, stand a 1 in 26 chance of dying during delivery, compared to a 1 in 4,800 chance for a mother in the United States. Investments in maternal health can deliver lifesaving results. If women had access to basic health services—such as a trained health care worker during delivery—80% of maternal deaths could be prevented. A healthy mother also means stronger, more healthy children. Today, 8.8 million children die before their fifth birthday. Pneumonia, diarrhea, malaria and the measles—preventable, treatable diseases that are no longer widespread in the United States—are the leading cause of child mortality worldwide. Children who lose their mothers are 5 times more likely to die in infancy than those who do not. But women who are healthy help ensure that their children attend school, eat as nutritiously as possible, and receive proper immunizations. Through simple, cost-effective means, we’ve helped cut the number of child deaths in half since 1960. We can do it again by 2020.

#### 3. No impact to disease - Extinction genetically impossible and ahistorical. Posner ’05,

Posner 2005 (Richard A., Judge U.S. Court of Appeals 7th Circuit, Professor Chicago School of Law, January 1, 2005, Skeptic, Altadena, CA, Catastrophe: Risk and Response, http://goliath.ecnext.com/coms2/gi\_0199-4150331/Catastrophe-the-dozen-most-significant.html#abstract)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time. That the human race has not yet been destroyed by germs created or made more lethal by modern science, as distinct from completely natural disease agents such as the flu and AIDS viruses, is even less reassuring. We haven't had these products long enough to be able to infer survivability from our experience with them. A recent study suggests that as immunity to smallpox declines because people am no longer being vaccinated against it, monkeypox may evolve into "a successful human pathogen," (9) yet one that vaccination against smallpox would provide at least some protection against; and even before the discovery of the smallpox vaccine, smallpox did not wipe out the human race. What is new is the possibility that science, bypassing evolution, will enable monkeypox to be "juiced up" through gene splicing into a far more lethal pathogen than smallpox ever was.

### AT Heg Bad (Proliferation)

#### 1. We access a larger internal to proliferation ---- hegemony may cause North Korean or Iranian nuclear acquisition but their arsenals are tiny --- their regional disputes with South Korea or Israel are unlikely to risk extinction --- whereas loss of leadership causes global proliferation. Rosen ‘3,

Rosen, 3 (Stephen Peter, PhD from Harvard University in 1979 and is currently the Beton Michael Kaneb Professor of National Security and Military Affairs in the Department of Government, Harvard University, “An Empire, If you Can Keep It,” The National Interest, Spring, LN Academic)

Rather than wrestle with such difficult and unpleasant problems, the United States could give up the imperial mission, or pretensions to it, now. This would essentially mean the withdrawal of all U.S. forces from the Middle East, Europe and mainland Asia. It may be that all other peoples, without significant exception, will then turn to their own affairs and leave the United States alone. But those who are hostile to us might remain hostile**, and be much less afraid** of the United States after such a withdrawal. Current friends would feel less secure and, in the most probable post-imperial world, would revert to the logic of **self-help** in which all states **do what they must to protect themselves.** This would imply the relatively rapid acquisition of weapons of mass destruction by Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Iran, Iraq and perhaps Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, Indonesia and others. Constraints on the acquisition of biological weapons would be even weaker than they are today. Major regional arms races would also be very likely throughout Asia and the Middle East. This would not be a pleasant world for Americans, or anyone else. It is difficult to guess what the costs of such a world would be to the United States. They would probably not put the end of the United States in prospect, but they would not be small. If the logic of American empire is unappealing**, it is not at all clear** that the alternatives are that much more attractive

#### 2. Military readiness controls the internal link. The a subpoint is it’s key to ferretting out and preventing attacks before they happen, even minimizes retaliation. The b subpoint is readiness makes countries more likely to ally with us and less likely to launch a nuclear strike.

#### 3. Heg solves proliferation in general– liberalism and security umbrella. Deudney et. al ’11,

Deudney et. al 2011 (Daniel is associate professor of Political Science at John’s Hopkins University. Edited by Michael Mastanduno, Professor of Government and Dean of Faculty at Dartmouth College, and G. John Ikenberry, Professor of Politics and International Affairs at Princeton University, William Wolforth, the Daniel Webster Professor at Dartmouth College, where he teaches in the Department of Government, “Unipolarity and nuclear weapons” International Relations Theory and the Consequences of Unipolarity pg. 305) BW

The diffusion of nuclear weapons in the international system is significantly entangled with the role of the unipolar hegemonic state. The existence of a unipolar state playing the role of a liberal hegemon has arguably been a major constraint on the rate and extent of proliferation. The extended military alliance system of the United States has been a major reason why many potentially nuclear states have forgone acquisition. Starting with Germany and Japan, and extending to a long list of European and East Asian states, the American alliances are widely understood to provide a “nuclear umbrella.” Overall, without such a state playing this role, proliferation would likely have been much more extensive. The liberal features of the American hegemonic sate also have contributed to constrain the rate and extent of proliferation. American leadership, and the general liberal internationalist vision of law-governed cooperative international politics, both enabled and infuses the non-proliferation regime. Similarly, the robust and inclusive liberal world trading system that has been a distinctive and salient feature of the American liberal hegemonic system offers integrating states paths to secure themselves that make nuclear acquisition less attractive.

### AT Heg Bad (Terrorism)

#### 1. Readiness solves 100% of their impacts and doesn’t link – an active and motivated army is key to deal with small-scale subnational threats and the effectiveness of our military isn’t the what motivates terrorists, it’s the ideological difference.

#### 2. Hegemony deters terrorists ---- decline emboldens them. Walt ’02,

Walt, 2002 (Stephen, professor of international affairs at Harvard, “American Primacy” http://www.nwc .navy.mil/press/review/2002/spring/art1-sp2.htm)

Perhaps the most obvious reason why states seek primacy—and why the United States benefits from its current position—is that international politics is a dangerous business. Being wealthier and stronger than other states does not guarantee that a state will survive, of course, and it cannot insulate a state from all outside pressures. But the strongest state is more likely to escape serious harm than weaker ones are, and it will be better equipped to resist the pressures that arise. Because the United States is so powerful, and because its society is so wealthy, it has ample resources to devote to whatever problems it may face in the future. At the beginning of the Cold War, for example, its power enabled the United States to help rebuild Europe and Japan, to assist them in developing stable democratic orders, and to subsidize the emergence of an open international economic order.7 The United States was also able to deploy powerful armed forces in Europe and Asia as effective deterrents to Soviet expansion.  When the strategic importance of the Persian Gulf increased in the late 1970s, the United States created its Rapid Deployment Force in order to deter threats to the West’s oil supplies; in 1990–91 it used these capabilities to liberate Kuwait. Also, when the United States was attacked by the Al-Qaeda terrorist network in September 2001, it had the wherewithal to oust the network’s Taliban hosts and to compel broad international support for its campaign to eradicate Al-Qaeda itself. It would have been much harder to do any of these things if the United States had been weaker. Today, U.S. primacy helps deter potential challenges to American interests in virtually every part of the world. Few countries or nonstate groups want to invite the “focused enmity” of the United States (to use William Wohlforth’s apt phrase), and countries and groups that have done so (such as Libya, Iraq, Serbia, or the Taliban) have paid a considerable price. As discussed below, U.S. dominance does provoke opposition in a number of places, but anti-American elements are forced to rely on covert or indirect strategies (such as terrorist bombings) that do not seriously threaten America’s dominant position. Were American power to decline significantly, however, groups opposed to U.S. interests would probably be emboldened and overt challenges would be more likely.

#### 3. Their evidence is all hype and propaganda – there hasn’t been a real terror threat for years. Friedman ‘6,

Friedman 6 (Ben, PhD student in MIT’s Poli Sci Department, member of the security studies program, February 9, pg. http://www.alternet.org/audits/31514/)

The other reason people overestimate risk is politics. When American assess danger they rely on their perceptions, but they also rely on experts in the news media. Experts, however, have interests and often exaggerate danger to serve them. From government bureaucrats seeking larger budgets, to contractors hawking technology, to congressmen campaigning, danger sells. It delivers money and votes. It also sells newspapers. Reporters report on danger, not its absence. Careerist think tank and academic analysts learn that grants, invitations to Capitol Hill, and jobs are more likely to go to those who trumpet threats and defenses against them than those who tell Americans to worry less. There is a structural tendency in America to exaggerate national security dangers. Despite this threat inflation, spending on homeland security remains tiny compared with defense spending. The homeland security budget for fiscal year (FY) 2006 is $49.9 billion, including the Department of Homeland Security ($42 billion), up from $32 billion in FY 2001. States only spend about $1-2 billion a year on homeland security in addition to federal outlays. Private corporations spend, at most,another $10 billion. In total then, the U.S. spends about $60 annually on homeland security. The defense budget for FY 2006, without the costs of the wars, is $440 billion, an increase of $135 billion over FY 2001. The extra spending goes to weapons and personnel that have little to do with terrorism. Widespread fear of terrorism has primarily benefited the budgets of part of the national security landscape that has the least to do with it.

### AT Heg Bad (War General)

#### 1. Hegemony prevents global nuclear war and checks escalation. Gray ’04,

Gray 2004 - Professor of International Politics and Strategic Studies at the University of Reading, and founded of the National Institute for Public Policy (Colin, “The Sheriff: America’s Defense of the New World Order, pg. 6-10)

Every condition of international order works for the particular benefit of some countries and the interests more that others, and needs defending. The alternatives to an American-led international order are just possibly eventual leadership by some other polity or coalition (probably Chinese, though possibly European, led), or, more likely, a lengthy period with no one wearing the sheriff’s badge. In that unwelcome event, every predatory regional and local power, many a dissatisfied ethnic or religious minority, most probably would chance its arm and seek its own destiny, by violence if need be. Violent struggle is all but essential to the success of the process of nation building. No doubt there are many ways in which order for security, hopefully promoting peace and justice, might be established and maintained. In the life of the modern state’s system, which is to say from the Treaty of Westphalia in 1684 to the present day (though many now proclaim the demise of this system), in practice only one ordering mechanism has been available: the balance of power. The dying embers of that hoary approach limed on even until 1991, when many of its American aficionados could still be found muttering about “the strategic balance,” while through the 1990s many a serious reference still was made to that abominable consequence of Cold War military competition, a condition of stability keyed to the mutuality of assured destruction (MAD). But, today there is no strategic balance, central or otherwise, and there is no political context of hostility to provide meaning to military rivalry between the United States and the new Russian Federation. There is no balance of power serving as the mainstay, the organizing architecture, of the current world order. What we have instead was flagged in the 1995 as a strong desideratum by the classical historian, Donald Kagan.   What seems to work best, even though imperfectly, is the possession by those states who wish to preserve the peace of the preponderant power and of the will to accept the burdens and responsibilities required to achieve that purpose.  As written, Kagan’s words could just about fit the folly of the theory of collective security. Of Course, he has no such noble nonsense in mind. What he is saying is that peace has to be kept, actively, and that it is best kept by a preponderance, not by an ever contestable balance, of power. Kagan’s historical judgment will serve as the test for this sermon on security. In principle there is both good and bad news in Kagan’s claim. It is good news that his lifetime’s ruminations on peace and war have yielded definite advice. Many academics would be uncomfortable writing as boldly as does Kagan. The bad news is that to the best of our knowledge, there is no hidden hand of history commanded to ensure that only commercially minded popular democracies shall inherit the mantle of preponderant power. It was never probable, but that power at century’s close might have been Nazi Germany or the USSR. Fortunately, chance favored civilizational merit for once, and the only candidate for sheriff today is the United States, a fact which is our second theme.   The United States is the, indeed is the only, essential protecting power for the current world order.  Again, this is not to be deterministic. Although there are no other bidders for this crown at present, it does not follow that the United States is condemned to play this role. After all, American world leadership in Paris 1919 was succeeded post haste by a scuttle from many potential international obligations. Americans today could elect to withdraw from the outside world, insofar as they could in political-military ways. They would hope that the civilizational offense given by soft power of their now globally beamed culture would not be found unduly provocative abroad. Whether The Great Satan, as Iranian spokespeople have delighted in calling the United States, would be allowed to hunker down in peaceful sanctuary in North America, we should doubt. Still, it could be tried. After September 11, 2001, isolationist sentiment temporarily has lost much of its appeal. We may not be much interested in terrorism, but it would appear that terrorism is interested in us. For good or ill, we are what we are. Exactly what this is has been explained in no uncertain terms by Henry Kissinger in the opening lines of his book, Does America Need a Foreign Policy? No prizes are awarded for guessing that his question is strictly rhetorical. Kissinger proclaims that:  At the dawn of the new millennium, the United States is enjoying a preeminence unrivalled by even the greatest empires of the past. From weaponry to entrepreneurship, from science to technology, from higher education to popular culture, America exercises an unparalleled ascendancy around the globe. During the last decade of the twentieth century, America’s preponderant position rendered it the indispensable component of international stability. The condition of unchallenged, indeed unchallengeable, primacy will not endure-it is not strategic history’s “last move”-but while it does the United States is the only candidate for sheriff. If Americans should decline the honor, they are at least uniquely well equipped to ensure that no one else could possibly succeed in that informal office. As Donald Kagan provided our basic text, quoted under the first point above, so it is only fitting that he should also be allowed to sound the warning bell. Kagan advises that:  Unexpected changes and shifts in power are the warp and woof of international history. The current condition of the world, therefore, were war among major powers is hard to conceive because one of them has overwhelming military superiority and no wish to expand, will not last.  Quite so. However, historians, perhaps especially ancient historians, should be expected to take the long view. And in the long view everything crumbles. But a suitable vision for the inspiration of policy, judicious choice of policy goals, and competence in strategy, should allow Americans to prolong their current strategic moment, as a later point makes explicit to be the sheriff of the current world order is a thankless role. American power may be necessary to restore such order as may be restorable, but Americans will not be loved, or even much appreciated, as a consequence. The rest of the world will be envious, fearful, and resentful, all the while seeking to use the leverage of American power for local purposes. There is no term extant that precisely captures the emerging U.S. role as sheriff of world order. For the first time since the mid-1960s, it has begun to be fashionable to refer to American policy and tasks as imperial. Andrew Bacevich, for one thoughtful example, suggest that “the preeminent challenge facing the United States in the twenty-first century is not eradicating terror but managing the informal American empire acquired during the course of the past century.” Empire, imperium even better, and hegemony, for all their popularity and at least partial suitability, carry baggage that can be distracting. Unless we are careful, such concepts themselves become part of the problem in the effort to conduct focused debate on U.S. policy and strategy. Despite the grounds for unease, we cannot deny the reality of common usage. For example, a review essay in Foreign Affairs opens with this claim: “The fact of America’s empire is hardly debated these days.” Allowing for the hyperbole and certain imprecision of meaning, still it is noteworthy that the author, Thomas Donnelly, feels able to make such a bold statement.   I prefer to think of the United States as the sheriff of the current world order, for reasons both of cultural fit concept and of tolerable accuracy. Naturally, this American role is largely self-appointed, though it can enjoy added dignity when it is blessed formally by majority votes in multinational institutions. For example, the Security Council of the United Nations licensed the United States to lead military action against Iraq in 1990-91, while the war against Yugoslavia over its “ethnic cleansing” of Kosovo in 1999 was a collective NATO, though not a UN undertaking. Because world politics comprises a distinctly immature political system, we have to be somewhat relaxed about some of the legal niceties. To call the United States the sheriff of the current world order is both description and prescription. This lawman role derives most essentially from the contemporary distribution of power, which so markedly favors the American superstate. Beyond that derivation, however, the role of sheriff is made easier to sustain by the more or less willing, though variably grudging, acquiescence of most countries.   Sheriff is of course a metaphor. By its use I mean to argue that the United States will act on behalf of others, as well as itself, undertaking some of the tough jobs of international security that no other agent or agency is competent to perform.   The American sheriff serves itself by serving the world selectively. This role requires the clearest of foreign policy explanations, lest it descend into strategic opportunism, or at least appears to do so.   U.S. material and spiritual resources are great, but not inexhaustible. They should not be expended casually in the pursuit of goals of only marginal national interest. Notwithstanding September 11 and its aftermath, the jury is out, and is likely to stay out awhile longer, on whether American society will tolerate the sheriff’s role as specified here, expect in contexts highly specific to obvious American interest. Those contexts may not include some which the world order will need a prudent sheriff to influence coercively (if not necessarily with force).  The United States is not, and should not and cannot be, the world’s policeman vis a vis any and every disturbance. The actions of this American sheriff of order are guided frankly by a national interest discriminator. The U.S. President needs to know: what has happened (or cost, of all kinds, are likely to attach to action, or inaction. If the United States does not serve itself through its peacemaking behavior, its career as sheriff will be brief indeed. Altruism has a thin record in strategic history and, we must assume, an unpromising future. That is just the way it is in world politics. However, if the United States seeks to serve only itself, and rides roughshod over the interests of others, again its career as functional sheriff will be brief. The world at large will discern scant reason to cooperate with the United States, if American statecraft is crassly applied strictly on behalf of narrowly American interests. At the level of principle, if not always in attempted application, some of the critics of American so called unilateralism are correct. The United States often is more powerful when it can act with others. This is not an invariable rule. By extension, when the sheriff departs the town he has cleansed, he wants to leave it in the hands of right-minded and hopefully capable citizens. One of the indispensable keys to success in this emerging era of American guardianship is for the maximum number of countries, and extra-national interests, to believe that the United States is protecting a world order in which they all have a vital, if sometimes differential, stake. People may resent the American sheriff, and naturally be residually suspicious of American motives. But they should be prepared to welcome American ordering activity which benefits all potential victims of disorder. Americans do not need to be loved. It is sufficient to be respected and, perhaps, appreciated for the self-assumed lawman role. The United States has an imperial history, of a sort, but has never acquired much of an imperial mindset. Commentators may discover new forms of imperialism to cover current American attitudes and behavior, and perhaps, but only perhaps, there is some small merit in the exercise. Americans are apt to view the world though missionary lenses. American is an idea, a civilization even (to stretch conceptual domain), rather than just another state. Globalization, beneath the hyperbole, is seen in America and elsewhere as equating approximately with Americanization. Whether or not, or to what extent, that is true is not a prime concern here. Instead, our gaze is fixed upon America’s role as chief protector, guardian, or sheriff of this new world with its globalizing flows of information, people, and goods. First and foremost, the United States is the agent of its own national interest, an interest that Washington, on a prudent day, judges vitally bound up with a particular idea of world order. The national interest discriminator to which reference has been made, allows a fairly reliable four-way categorization of issues. Issues can be of survival character: they can be vital: they can be major: or they can be “other.” Survival issues must be fought for. Vital interests should be defended forcefully. Major interests might possibly be protected militarily. “Other” interests should not attract the U.S. cavalry – unless, that is, the cost is believed to be extraordinarily low (but beware of the surprise that friction and chance in war may throw your way.) The political context, or perhaps the timing, may multiply the significance of matters that otherwise would be of little concern to Washington (e.g. almost anything in the Balkans). A useful approach to understanding the U.S. role as sheriff is by means of another four-way split. Given the contemporary, and at least short-term predictable, distribution of power (which admittedly is different in its political-military, economic, and cultural dimensions), the objectively desirable U.S. role typically is as plain as it is not yet acceptable politically to proclaim out loud. With respect to protecting the world order, my seconf four-way split, tied inalienably to the four-way national interest discriminator, is the following: There are problems that only the United States can address in hopes of achieving decisive success; there are problems that the United States should stand a reasonable prospect of meeting and at least alleviating; there are problems concerning which the United States should be expected to fare poorly; and finally, there are problems that the United States has absolutely no plausible prospect whatsoever of alleviating, let alone of resolving (e.g., resucuing and restoring certain failed states). It may be needless to add that in most cases the active support of some friends and allies will, on balance, be a significant, though rarely essential, benefit. The United States could pick up its military ball and go home. It could choose to rely for world order on the hidden hand of universal commercial self-interest somewhat guided by such regional and local balances and imbalances of power as may be extant or might emerge. In effect, frequently this would translate as a green light for regional bullies to mark out their territories (and sea space and air space). Thus far, the contemporary United States is showing no persuasive evidence of an inclination to bring itself home as a political military influence. The issue is not whether America’s skills in statescraft are fully adequate for the sheriff role (whose would be?). Rather, it is whether there is to be a sheriff at all. If the United States declines the honor, or takes early retirement, there is no deputy sheriff, waiting, trained and ready for promotion. Furthermore, there is no world-ordering mechanism worthy of the name which could substitute for the authority and strength of the American Superpower. At present there is no central axis of a balance of power to keep order, while the regional balances in the Middle East and South and East Asia are as likely to provoke as to cool conflict – and conflict with weapons of mass destruction (WMD) at that.

#### 2. Readiness controls the internal link – strong, active US military solves conflicts before they escalate and encourages nations not to go to war in order to gain US support. And, even if conflicts occur, they’re decided quickly in favor of whichever side the US chooses.

#### (Prolif Answers also apply – they control the internal link into conflict escalation)

### AT Politics

#### The plan is politically popular—republicans and the public both support military budget spending. Hennigan ‘14

W.J. HENNIGAN. Republican control of Congress could mean more military spending. November 8 2014. http://www.latimes.com/business/la-fi-defense-spending-20141108-story.html

With Republican majorities now assured in both houses of Congress, Pentagon spending is likely to grow to cope with national security threats around the globe. The White House announced Friday that it would request $5.6 billion in additional funds from Congress for airstrikes and other operations against Islamic State fighters in Iraq and Syria. The total includes $1.6 billion to develop and train Iraqi security forces, which were routed by the Sunni militants last summer. But that figure may be dwarfed if Republican hawks follow through on promises to roll back mandatory defense spending cuts imposed by a government-wide budget cut known as sequestration. Pentagon officials certainly hope so. "We need Congress' support to get done so many of the things that we're trying to get done, not the least of which is taking sequestration off our backs," said Rear Adm. John Kirby, a Pentagon spokesman. The Republican sweep in Tuesday's election puts Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.), a strong critic of defense cuts, on track to take over the powerful Senate Armed Services Committee. McCain already has called for stepping up the campaign against Islamic State, doing more to defeat Syrian President Bashar Assad and providing arms to Ukraine to fend off Russian forces, among other actions. That could mean federal funding will flow more freely to defense contractors in aerospace-rich places like Southern California, which suffered waves of layoffs over fears related to Pentagon spending cuts. "National security was a big issue during the elections; it was out front," said Cord Sterling, vice president for legislative affairs at the Aerospace Industries Assn., a trade and lobbying organization in Arlington, Va. "There's likely to be an attempt to redraft budgets." With U.S. combat troops out of Iraq and being withdrawn from Afghanistan, the Pentagon was under pressure to lower war-related spending in the last round of budget requests for fiscal 2015. The overseas contingency operations request, which still must be voted on by Congress, now is likely to be increased, analysts say. At the time, the Pentagon requested $58.6 billion — about $20 billion less than the 2014 request. But that was before Islamic State fighters seized major cities in Iraq and publicly beheaded Western journalists, sparking a sharp uptick in public concern. Now American bombers, fighter jets and drones flying missions over Iraq and Syria will need maintenance and spare parts. Hundreds of smart bombs dropped on militant strongholds will need to be replaced. Intelligence gathering technology will be required for what the White House has warned will be a drawn-out fight. Already aerospace giants Raytheon Co. and Boeing Co. have won lucrative contracts for high-tech weapons that were used in the battle against Islamic State. "There is a chance for big change coming out of these elections," said Ryan Crotty, budget analyst with the nonpartisan Center for Strategic and International Studies. "Lawmakers seem to be speaking with a more united voice, which is good news for defense." Defense contractors also are playing a role in the U.S. effort to combat the Ebola outbreak in West Africa. Some 1,030 U.S. troops are building isolation wards, training healthcare workers, processing laboratory samples and providing other assistance in Liberia, the hardest-hit country, and in neighboring Senegal, where the military has set up a staging area to move supplies. Earlier this week, defense firm Northrop Grumman Corp. announced a contract worth up to $27 million with the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases to maintain a database for pathogenic viruses such as Ebola.